

REMARKS

Response to Claim Rejections – 35 USC §103

MPEP §2143.03 All Claim Limitations Must Be Considered

"All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art." *In re Wilson*, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970). If an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. 103, then any claim depending there from is nonobvious. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

The Office Action dated July 23, 2007 has been carefully considered. Claims 1-14, 17-20 and 26-28 are active in this application. Further examination and reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1-14, 17-20 and 26-28 are respectfully requested.

The rejection of claim 1-5, 6-8, 14, 18, 20 and 26-28 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adachi (US 6,877,037) in view of Forlenza et al. (US 6,553,103 B1) is respectfully traversed. However, in order to further define applicants' invention, independent claims 1, 14, 18 and 20 have been amended as presented herein.

Claim 1 recites "the data object update message being capable of changing the meaning of the macro." Adachi does not teach the use of macros as pointed out in the Office Action, page 3, which states " Adachi does not specifically teach macros for communication that are representative of a message for communications, the data object update message being capable of changing the meaning of the macro, and referencing a macro number corresponding to an associated macro." Although Forlenza teaches the use of macros, Forlenza does not teach the use of "a data object update message being capable of changing the meaning of the macro" as claimed in claim 1. Similarly, as amended, independent claims 14, 18 and 20 recite the limitation of a data object update message being capable of changing the meaning of the macro which is not found in Adachi or in Forlenza or their combination.

Claims dependent from the rejected independent claims are submitted as being patentably distinct from the cited references since they merely contain limitations in addition to those claims from which they depend. The rejection of the dependent claims of claims 1, 14, 18 and 20 are respectfully traversed for the reasons stated above.

The rejection of claims 9-13, 17 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adachi in view of Forlenza and Sakakura is respectfully traversed. Neither these references taken singly nor in combination teach, suggest or make obvious a data object update message being capable of changing the meaning of the macro as recited in claims 9-13, 17 and 19 based on their dependency on independent claims 1, 14 and 18.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Such allowance is respectfully solicited.

Please charge Deposit Account No. 17-0026 for any fees associated with the Petition for a Three-Month Extension of Time. Applicants do not believe any other fees are due regarding this amendment. If any extension of time fees or any other fees are required, however, please charge Deposit Account No. 17-0026. Applicants encourage the Examiner to telephone the Applicants' attorney should any issues remain.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 23, 2008

By:


Richard A. Bachand
Reg. No. 25,107

QUALCOMM Incorporated
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121
Telephone: (858) 651-4125
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502